

**Minutes**  
**Beaches and Shores Advisory Committee**  
**Tuesday, October 1, 2015, 9:00 a.m.**  
**Building Construction Services Large Conference Room**  
**18400 Murdock Circle, Port Charlotte, FL 33948**

*\*\*\*Please note that one or more Charlotte County Commissioners may be in attendance at any meeting of the Beaches and Shores Advisory Committee\*\*\**

**Members Present**

Tommy Brock, District 3 / Vice Chairman  
Dick Whitney, District 1  
Robert Pierce, FL Shore & Beach Preservation Assoc.  
Katherine Ariens, District 2

**Members Excused**

Clifford Kewley, Member-at-Large, Chairman  
[vacant], District 5  
Rich Parchen, District 4

**Staff Present**

Commissioner Stephen R. Deutsch  
Commissioner Bill Truex  
Chuck Mopps, Charlotte County Engineering Division  
Lynette Auger, Natural Resources  
Gayle Moore, Recording Secretary

**Guests Present**

Michael Poff, Coastal Engineering Consultants  
Wilma Katz, CWC  
Norma Jean Zvosec  
Jeff Bisgrove, Bermont Excavating & Mining  
Rebekah McCrackin, Tamarind Gulf & Bay Resident  
Brook & Sandy Risner  
Ken & Randi Kozio  
Steve Reilly, Sun-Herald  
Capt. Ron Blago, MAC Liaison

**Call to Order**

Vice-Chairman Tommy Brock called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and the Recording Secretary indicated that a quorum was not yet present. Within a few moments, Mr. Whitney and Mr. Pierce arrived, and the quorum was made.

On motion made by Ms. Ariens, seconded by Mr. Whitney and carried unanimously, the Minutes from May 7, 2015, were approved as received.

No deletions or additions to the agenda were requested. Vice-Chair Brock briefly summarized the agenda topics for today, and then turned to Citizen Comments related to the agenda.

**Citizens Comments on Agenda Items**

None were offered.

## **New Business**

*None was offered.*

## **Old Business**

*The presentation by Mr. Mopps and Mr. Poff was followed by an extensive discussion period. In order to keep transcribed minutes to a reasonable length, it is recommended that interested parties refer to the audio file, which is available at this URL:*

*<https://www.charlottecountyfl.gov/boards-committees/bsac/Pages/Meeting-Minutes.aspx> (Under "Meeting Audio" right-click on the link for **October 1, 2015** and choose the option to "save target as" saving the mp3 file to your desktop; you can then listen to the audio file in your preferred media player.)*

### Update on the Stump Pass 10-Year Inlet Management Plan

Mr. Mopps provided comments regarding the current status of the project review, advising members and citizens of the location online of constantly-updated information on both projects being discussed today (<https://www.charlottecountyfl.gov/projects/Pages/Project-Details.aspx?project=12> ).

Mr. Poff then addressed the group, noting that the DEP permit for the long-term plan has been issued; he gave details of the prospective stages of the project. He mentioned the National Marine Fisheries and their backlog of projects to review as the last remaining agency which is affecting the forward motion of the project; he indicated there would be an update on scheduling given at the November meeting. He said he anticipated a Notice to Proceed being issued on December 15<sup>th</sup>, and a five-six month construction duration, with a goal of completion by June-July 2016. He detailed other environmental periods (e.g. regarding sea turtle nesting season next May 1<sup>st</sup>) that would affect the beginning of construction, sand placement, and other project timing, and discussed the project elements that need to be accomplished by nesting time.

In response to a question from Mr. Pierce, Mr. Poff indicated that the project goes out to bid after the permits are in hand; Mr. Mopps also commented on efforts staff is making to ensure that this project is ready to move on to the next stage as soon as any approval are available. Mr. Poff and Mr. Mopps responded to a number of questions regarding contractor time frames and structure of the bid to a single contractor who would sub-out portions of the work, public notice requirements and other details; further discussion ensued on these points.

Ms. Ariens questioned which were the most likely contractors for a job of this magnitude; Mr. Poff responded that Great Lakes Dredge and Dock, Weekes Marine, and a few others typically bid large offshore dredge projects in Southwest Florida. Ms. Ariens inquired whether they ever use smaller local companies as subs; Mr. Poff responded that it's down to who can do the work, noting that e.g., for the rock work, most dredge contractors don't do their own, they seek out local qualified contractors. Ms. Ariens spoke further on behalf of local contractors who want the work; Commissioner Deutsch commented regarding this part of the process and the "local preference" part of Charlotte County bidding rules. For off-shore work, however, he noted that there are not a lot of firms in Charlotte County who are capable of handling it. Guest Mr. Jeff Bisgrove commented on using the local mines instead of a firm like Great Lakes.

Vice-Chair Brock asked whether the work would include any structure on the north end of Palm Island, and Mr. Poff indicated no. There being no further comments on the Stump Pass project, the group then moved on to the Beach Erosion Study for North Manasota Key.

Beach Erosion Study for North Manasota Key

Commissioner Truex arrived at 9:22 am

Mr. Mopps commenced by showing the group where to find updates on this project on the County website. The stakeholder PowerPoint presentation then commenced; see the PowerPoint report at this URL:

<https://www.charlottecountyfl.gov/projects/Project%20Documents/ManasotaKeyNorthBeachStakeholderPresentation15082-09302015.pdf>

Additional reports and maps are available in the RELATED LINKS column of this County web page:

<https://www.charlottecountyfl.gov/projects/Pages/Project-Details.aspx?project=66>

Mr. Poff then narrated the stakeholder presentation, taking comments and questions throughout. Covered topics included the history and details of the prior erosion and current conditions including the ten-foot deep trough that has formed near the rock revetments, the nature and importance of the nearshore hard bottom, the beach renourishment study in 2003 and the failure to achieve consensus on this project in the past, which reflected three issues: 1) a belief that natural sand movements would be sufficient to protect structures; 2) disinclination to pay the costs associated with renourishment; and 3) lack of trust in working with the government. People in the first group also did not want to open the beach up to public access, which would be required for any publicly funded nourishment project.

The review of sand source considerations generated discussion including considerations about the bridge's ability to handle the truck traffic associated with the large amount of material that would be required if upland sand mines were utilized; the conflict of this traffic with the normal tourist-season traffic burden and the residents' ability to put up with it. Overall, the recommendation was to keep all prospective sand sources (offshore and upland) on the table. Another significant discussion revolved around the requirement for recreating the nearshore hard bottom through mitigation, which was characterized as the number one challenge communities face in permitting new projects; the concept of the protected resource and the need to reconstruct it "like for like" was also explored at length. There was a high level of confidence attached to the prediction that the project could be permitted, based on a range of other localities that had already successfully gone through the process.

Ms. Ariens questioned the advantage of Charlotte County partnering with Sarasota County; Mr. Poff indicated the advantages would be covered later in the presentation. The presentation then turned to the most likely projected schedule, and it was noted that costs had been expressed in 2019 dollars, since the project would most likely extend to that time frame; the possible costs for each of the three proposed concept plans were then examined.

Commissioner Truex commented in response to Ms. Ariens' points about those who might decline to participate in the renourishment project, noting that people to the south who are hold-outs will end up costing their neighbors a great deal of money; he emphasized the need to try to get this message out during the West County outreach meetings on this subject. Further discussion ensued on this and other points related to the funding and the full participation of Key residents. Mr. Poff commented that there have been more construction easements signed this time around than ever before, which was an indication of progress. Vice Chairman Brock commented that he felt EVERY landowner should

contribute, and by that he means also the County and the State; Mr. Poff referenced the various funds that the state has already contributed to these activities over time.

Further discussion continued on the subject of funding, with Mr. Poff indicating that the Army Corps of Engineers was not receptive to requests for the Erosion Control project as the Corps could not derive a positive benefit to cost ratio under federal standard. The Erosion Control project was eligible for FEMA post-storm recovery dollars in 2006 and 2011. He also mentioned the option of making application for RESTORE ACT funds, and recommended this project be considered. He reviewed the various other sources of funding including MSTU, MSBU, tourist bed-tax dollars; he did not feel the project would qualify for WCIND and BIF as the beach segment was outside the influence of Stump Pass. He restated some of the funding (matching local dollars for beach nourishment) that the state had provided for the Erosion Control project, more than four million dollars to date, and then spoke about the complex formula that is applied to determine the extent of state funding participation, with reference to a chart that indicated the items that county residents can collectively work on to improve ranking. One example which was given was of condominium complexes which have re-done their bylaws to become "vacation rental condos" in order to get state cost sharing for beach projects, something not available to a straight condominium. Further discussion of these options continued, along with references to MSBU approaches.

Ms. Ariens left for another meeting at 10:37a.m., but asked that the group address the issue of the people whose property is under immediate threat and what options they might have in advance of a possible 2019 construction timeframe. Mr. Poff indicated that there are a number of solutions, including bringing in small quantities of sand, applying armoring if there is none already or, if there is, converting it to a sea-wall, and things of that nature, all of which are subject to permitting. In answer to another question, he indicated that there would not be public monies available for these temporary solutions; and that any temporary structures may end up having to be removed when the actual beach nourishment program started.

Mr. Bisgrove commented that his solution would be a 5% tax on all tourist spending, though he did not indicate how tourists would be distinguished from full-time residents. Commissioner Truex indicated that such a tax imposition would be by referendum and it was an unlikely solution, based on how difficult it was to get a 1% sales tax through the referendum process. Ms. McCracken reminded the group that tourists are already subject to a 12% tax, part of which comes to the County.

Final comments on the PowerPoint presentation concerned what was being sought in terms of stakeholder input, a show of support for the project primarily by continuing to contact the Commissioners, including an expression of willingness to pay a fair share of the costs. Also important: expressing a preference on one of the three plans; support for public access and public parking to increase the cost sharing potential with the state; support for creation of the necessary MSBU. Discussion ensued on these points.

### **Citizen Comments**

Vice-Chair Brock opened the floor to citizen comments, which continued for the balance of the meeting on various topics.

*In order to keep transcribed minutes to a reasonable length, it is recommended that interested parties refer to the audio file, which is available at this URL:*

*<https://www.charlottecountyfl.gov/boards-committees/bsac/Pages/Meeting-Minutes.aspx>*

*(Under "Meeting Audio" right-click on the link for **October 1, 2015** and choose the option to "save target as" saving the mp3 file to your desktop; you can then listen to the audio file in your preferred media player.)*

**Staff Comments**

None offered.

**Member Comments**

Vice Chairman Brock asked if an Erosion Control Line was going to be established from Englewood Beach southward on the Key, now while the beach is still of substantial depth; Mr. Mopps responded that there are still numerous residents in that area that will not allow even a survey crew to do that work. Discussion continued regarding this situation; Mr. Mopps suggested that Steven Kipa of the Real Estate Services office of the County would be a good resource for learning more about the properties.

Vice Chairman Brock noted that the next meeting would be held on November 5, 2015 in Commission Chambers.

**Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was offered by Mr. Whitney; the meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Moore  
Recording Secretary

Minutes Approved by

Clifford Kewley, Chairman  
Beaches & Shores Advisory Committee